

UNITED STATE EPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	· I	ATTY, DOCKET NO.
08/863,18		7 PHILIPPE	J XI/P3139US1	
		-		EXAMINER
		15M1/0114		
LARSON AN			LRVY N	PAPER NUMBER
	STREET SOUT	n	7411 64111	3
			1502	
			DATE MAILED:	01/14/98
				01,14,50
This is a communication for COMMISSIONER OF PAT	rom the examiner in ch TENTS AND TRADEM	arge of your application. ARKS		•
		OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY	1	
Responsive to commun	nication(s) filed on _	5/27/97		
☐ This action is FINAL.				•
<del>-</del> .	- la conditi \$ : 11-		no to the	le closed in
		wance except for formal matters, prosecution to Quayle, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213	i as to the merits	13 C10580 III
A shortened statutory perk	nd for response to th	is action is set to expire	month(s), or	thirty days
whichever is longer, from th	ne mailing date of thi	s communication. Failure to respond within the	e period for respon	se will cause
the application to become a 1.136(a).	abandoned. (35 U.S	.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained	d under the provisi	ions of 37 CFR
Disposition of Claims				
D (2)-(1)	-47		is/oro pop	ding in the application.
Of the above, claim(s)			is/are withdray	wn from consideration.
Claim(s)				is/are allowed.
Claim(s)	- <u>4</u> 7			is/are rejected.
Claim(s)	······································			is/are objected to
Claim(s)		are su	bject to restriction t	or election requirement.
Application Papers		•		
See the attached Notic	ce of Draftsperson's	Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.	1	
The drawing(s) filed or		is/are objected t		
The proposed drawing			is [_] approve	d disapproved.
The specification is ob The oath or declaration	•			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119			•
Acknowledgment is m	ade of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).		1
All Some*	None of the CE	RTIFIED copies of the priority documents have	e been	
received.				;
	ation No. (Series Co		·	
received in this na	ational stage applicat	tion from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1	7.2(a)).	
*Certified copies not rec	ceived:			<del></del>
Acknowledgment is m	ade of a claim for do	mestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).		
Attachment(s)			•	
Notice of Reference C	Cited, PTO-892	•		6
☐ Information Disclosure	e Statement(s), PTO	-1449, Paper No(s)		make parties of the control of the c
☐ Interview Summary, P	180 C 77% W.C			/ :
Notice of Draftperson		eview, PTO-948	~	•
Notice of Informal Pat			•	;
I TOUCH OF BUILDING LE	<del>pp</del>	* *** ***	* _	

-SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES-

Art Unit: 1502

Receipt is acknowledged of Prior Paper (May 27, 1997.

Claims 1-17 and 21-47 are rejected under 35
U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

"Or other", "derivatives" (claim 11) "in particular", "such as", preferably", and "characterized", "high degree". It is unclear if "proportion" (claim 32) should be amount or concentration. It is unclear how "efficacy" is to be interpreted; thus "95%" is indefinite as there is no baseline efficacy. There is no "long lasting" antecedent for claims 43-46.

Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

Art Unit: 1502

enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

One in that art is given insufficient information to identify intended use concentrations and conditions, to meet the requirement "ensure efficacy", or "for more than months", claims 32-38 specify a proportion but do not indicate of what to what. Efficacy "is inoperable, as it is not defined: It is unclear why the proviso of claims 1, 21 and 22 exist.

## Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

<sup>(</sup>b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1502

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Buntain et al. EP 0,295,117.

See Example 12, page 11. The instant claim 11 derivation and compound at 0.5-25% of PVC is prepared as collar or as an ear tag, for domestic animals/dogs. Since the compound, use and host dog species of, "domestic animals" are the instant, characteristics and attributes also are, inherently. Further compound forms of the instant claims are at pages 1-4; species controlled at pages 4-6, including arthropods rectors, (page 6) fleas and ticks.

Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Senbo - 5,567,129.

Art Unit: 1502

Show the instant compounds (columns 1-2) and concentrations (column 4, lines 7-12) and devices (column 3) for protection against the same pests (column 2, bottom) as the instant claims, thus, inherently, providing the same degree of protection.

## Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buntain et al., Huang et al. and Senbo - 5,567,429.

Art Unit: 1502

As shown above, Buntain and Senbo provide the same compounds, shown effective against the same arthropods, shown as rectors, thus, obvious to use in control devices, as is known in the art. There is no distinguishing disclosure of the instant composition as providing any unusual and/or expected results obtained since the prior art is well aware of the use of the instant pesticides to control pests. No criticality or objective showing of unobvious or unexpected results are presented by applicant.

The selection of active ingredients and polymer are result effective parameters chosen to obtain the desired effects. It would be obvious to vary the concentration and form of each ingredient to optimize the effect desired, and the use of ingredients for the functionality for which they are known to be used is not a basis for patentability.

Art Unit: 1502

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neil Levy whose telephone number is (703) 308-2412. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page, can be reached on (703) 308-2927. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-5408.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2351.

Neil Levy:cb Primary Examiner

Monday, January 5, 1998

NEIL S. LEW
PATENT EXAMINER
PATENT EXAMINER